

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 4-11, 13, 14, 17-26, 28, 32-41 and 43-47 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 5, 13, 17, and 32. No claims are withdrawn or cancelled herein. No new claims are added herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on October 6, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references, namely Bent and Ebbo. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals and agreed that the proposed claim amendments appeared to overcome the cited references. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0007] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0008] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0009] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0010] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 5, 13, 17, and 32 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112 2nd ¶

[0011] Claims 13 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶. Furthermore, in light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0012] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-11, 13, 14, 17-26, 28, 32-41 and 43-47 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0013] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0014] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Bent:** *Bent, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,463,442 (issued October 8, 2002); and
- **Ebbo:** *Ebbo, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0025728 (issued February 6, 2003).

Overview of the Application

[0015] The Application describes a technology for a data item that has a data item property with an associated value and a user interface element that has an element property with a value that can be defined by an association to the data item property. A binding definition associates the element property of the user interface element with the data item property such that an application program which generates a user interface for display can be developed independent of the data item, and such that the data item can be developed independent of display-related information corresponding to the user interface element.

Cited References

[0016] The Examiner cites Bent as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Ebbo as the secondary reference in the obviousness-based rejections.

Bent

[0017] Bent describes a technology for a container independent data binding system that independently facilitates data binding by way of a binding agent object on behalf of any data consumer and/or data source that conforms to the necessary interfaces and protocols. The binding agent facilitates data binding and transparent data access for any visual and/or non-visual object, in addition to control data verification for client-side control validation independent

of a container, binding collection for non-data aware objects that can benefit from data binding, data conversion and formatting to control User Interface displays in the context of data binding, and repeater control to facilitate a list view for visual objects, for any object that requires and requests access to these features rather than individually implementing these features without binding agent support.

Ebbo

[0018] Ebbo describes a technology for creating an intermediate language or source code file from a server-side resource or dynamic web page file using a hierarchically specified set of user controls. The source code can then be compiled into an executable class allowing for rapid generation of web page control objects that perform server-side functions, including the rendering of client responses. The code generation scheme of the present invention is capable of creating control objects connected in a hierarchy to handle event processing and the setting of attributes to the specific objects.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0019] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Bent and Ebbo

[0020] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-11, 13, 14, 17-26, 28, 32-41 and 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bent and Ebbo. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0021] Applicant submits that the combination of Bent and Ebbo do not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- ***"a data style definition configured to define a visual representation of the data item on a user interface..."***
- "a transform definition developed as a logic component of an application program, the transform definition configured to generate a transformed value of the data item property for association with an

element property of the user interface element , wherein the transform definition is interjected in a data path between the data item and the user interface, wherein the transform definition changes how the data item value is represented, wherein representation of the data item is dependent upon the transform definition, ***wherein the transform definition is separate and distinct from the data style definition and is applied to the data item prior to the data style definition...***"

[0022] In contrast, Bent describes a binding agent for binding a data source to a data consumer. The data consumer may possess a format object to dictate how data from the data source is represented to the data consumer. And as cited in col. 16, lines 3-24, the format object may include a number of different formatting operations. For example, one operation may convert a binary data type to a variant data type. In the Examiner's response to arguments in the Office Action, the Examiner equates the format object to the transform definition and the formatting operations to the data style definition.

[0023] In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the transform definition is separate and distinct from the data style definition and applied to a data item before it. The combined references simply do not disclose, teach, or suggest separate and distinct transform definitions and data style definitions. The formatting operations, which the Examiner equates to the data style definition, *are part of* the format object, which the Examiner equates to the transform definition. Further, amended claim 1 recites, "the transform definition...is applied to a data item *prior to* the data style definition." In Bent in

contrast, there is no application of the format object before application of the formatting operations. In fact, there is disclosure of any application of the format object *at all*, except through the formatting operations.

[0024] Further, nothing in the references discloses any sort of “data style definition” that defines “a visual representation of the data item on a user interface.” The formatting operations cited by the Examiner transform a data type (such as from binary to variant), but are not disclosed, taught, or suggested as defining a visual representation of the data item. Presumably, type could be altered without inherently altering the visual representation. Thus, Bent and Ebbo do not even disclose, teach, or suggest a data style definition as claimed in claim 1.

[0025] As shown above, the combination of Bent and Ebbo do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 17 and 32

[0026] Claims 17 and 32 include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 17 and 32 are patentable over Bent and Ebbo.

Dependent Claims 4-11, 13, 14, 18-26, 28, 33-41, and 43-47

[0027] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 17, and 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 17, and 32 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0028] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/ Dated: October 30, 2008

Kasey C. Christie (kasey@leehayes.com; x4732)

Registration No. 40,559

Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-315-4001 x6019)

Registration No. 56,826

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com